(1) (5)

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BILASPUR (C.G.)

W.P. NO. 2802 /2006 **SINGLE BENCH**

PETITIONERS

1. Vinod Kumar Patel, aged about 22 years, S/o Panik Ram Patel, R/o Chaple via Kharsiya, District – Raigarh.
2. Radheshyam Patel, aged about 20 years, S/o Bhoj Raj Patel, R/o Village Pandripani, via Kharsiya, District – Raigarh
3. Roshan Lal Sahu, Aged about 21 years, S/o Mohan Lal Sahu, R/o Village- Bhainapara via Kharsiya District- Raigarh.
4. Jaiprakash Patel, Aged about 27 Years, S/o Shri Din Dayal Patel, R/o Kunkuni, Kharsiya, District – Raigarh.(CG)

P.R. No. 2874/06
Presented by Shri Jaiprakash
dated 11/6/06

Versus

RESPONDENTS

1. State of Chhattisgarh, Through the Secretary, Department of Panchayat Rural Development, D.K.S Bhawan, Raipur (C.G.)
2. Commissioner, Department of Panchayat and Rural Development Raipur (C.G.)
3. The Collector cum District Co-ordinator (Rastriya Rojgar Guaranty Yojna) Raigarh District- Raigarh.
4. Chief Executive Officer, Jila Panchayat, Raigarh, District- Raigarh.
5. Chief Executive Officer, Janpad Panchayat Kharsiya, District – Raigarh.

RECEIVED COPY
CLERK TO [illegible] BILASPUR
11/6/06

(2)
6

PETITION UNDER ARTICLE 226 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA FOR ISSUANCE OF APPROPRIATE WRITS OF MANDAMUS AND CERTIORARY AND FOR OTHER SUITABLE WRITS AND DIRECTIONS :-

उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ़, बिलासपुर

मामला क्रमांक ..WP(W)..2132/06 **सन् 200**

37

आदेश पत्रक (पूर्वानुबद्ध)

आदेश का दिनांक तथा आदेश क्रमांक	हस्ताक्षर सहित आदेश	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश
	16.6.2006:- Shri Vishnu Koshta, counsel for the petitioners. Shri Satish Gupta, Deputy Govt. Advocate for the State/ respondents. Heard both the counsel. By this petition, the petitioners have questioned legality and propriety of the order Annexure-P/6 dated 26-4-2006 whereby the appointment order dated 17-4-2006 Annexure-P/4 regarding appointment of the petitioners and others on the post of Gram Rojgar Sahayak has been recalled on the ground that the said order was passed without following reservation and in the meeting dated 25-4-2006 it has been decided to follow the reservation. As the impugned order itself is self contained that the order regarding appointment of Gram Rojgar Sahayak was made without following reservation in the appointment, therefore, the petitioners cannot raise illegitimate grievance against the impugned order, as such the petitioners have not been able to make out a case for interference by this Court under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India. The writ petition is, therefore, liable to be dismissed and it is hereby dismissed. Consequently, M.(W.)P. No.2132/2006 stands disposed of. Sd/- L.C. Bhadoo Judge	

Barve